

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on March 29, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully considered. Additionally attached to this Amendment are a Petition for Extension of Time and a Request for Continued Examination.

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended the specification, amended claim 14, and canceled claim 16. Claim 14 is the independent claim. Claims 14-15 and 17-18 remain pending in the application. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The Examiner's Action has rejected claims 14-17 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph. However, the original specification provides sufficient antecedent basis for the recitation "a sealing print formed on each of a top outermost periphery portion, a bottom outermost periphery portion, and two side outermost periphery portions of both said face and said back, the sealing print being formed on outer surfaces of both said face and said back, said outermost periphery portions abutting said edge, the sealing print crossing said edge so as to extend from said face to said back without discontinuity," as recited in amended claim 14. The original specification describes that a sealing print 51 is formed on the lid 11 and around the folding line 12, and, after being folded, the sealing print 51 crosses the top portion of the face 10 and the back 20 so that any intention cut for taking out the enclosure on the top portion will leave noticeable evidence on the envelope/bag (see Applicant's specification, page 4, lines 19-23).

Similarly, the original specification further describes that a sealing prints 52 is formed on bottom portions of the face 10 and the back 20 and across the bottom edge

AMENDMENT

10/759,302

31 so that any intentional cut on the bottom portion will leave noticeable evidence on the envelope/bag (see the specification, page 4, lines 25-27), and two sealing prints 53, 54 are formed on two side portions of the face 10 and the back 20 and across the side edges 32, 33 so that any intentional cut on any side portion will leave noticeable evidence on the envelope/bag (see the specification, page 5, lines 2-4).

In addition, Applicant's Figures 3 and 4 together support that (1) the sealing print 51 is formed on the top outermost periphery portion of the outer surface of the face 10 and the back 20, (2) the sealing print 52 is formed on the bottom outermost periphery portion of the outer surface of the face 10 and the back 20, and (3) the sealing prints 53, 54 are formed on two side outermost periphery portions of the outer surface of the face 10 and the back 20. Figures 1-4 also supports that the folding line 21 itself is a top edge formed by the top of the face 10 and the back 20. Figures 3 and 4 further support that the sealing prints 51, 52, 53, 54 respectively cross the top, the bottom, and the two side edges so as to extend from the face 10 to the back 20 without discontinuity. In addition, the specification has been amended to correct informalities. It is submitted that no new matter has been added to the claims, and it is thus requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

The Examiner's Action rejects claims 14-17 as being anticipated by *Taylor* (USP 203,091). It is respectfully submitted that the invention now defined by these claims is clearly patentable over the cited reference for at least the following reasons.

Amended claim 14 is directed to an envelope/bag for leaving visible evidence when it is opened. As disclosed by Applicant's specification, in the conventional

confidential envelope, an intruder can access the envelope without any sign of being already opened (1) by cutting the envelope at the edge of the envelope and by gluing it back or (2) by peeling the sealed area apart.

Applicant's claimed invention overcomes these problems by providing a sealing zone and a sealing print. In particular, the invention as defined in amended claim 14 recites that periphery portions of the face and the back are adhered to each other to form a sealing zone within the face and the back. This claim further recites that a sealing print formed on each of a top outermost periphery portion, a bottom outermost periphery portion, and two side outermost periphery portions of both the face and the back. This claim further recites that the sealing print is formed on outer surfaces of both the face and the back. Amended claim 14 further recites that the outermost periphery portions abut the edge, and the sealing print crosses the edge so as to extend from the face to the back without discontinuity.

Specifically speaking, when referring to the following Fig. 1 (which is a partial sectional view of a sealed confidential envelope of the invention), the amended claim 14 recites that the sealing zone 41 is formed within inner surfaces of the face 10 and the back 20, and the sealing print 51 is formed on outer surfaces of the face 10 and the back 20. This shows that any intruder intentionally cuts the envelope at any sealing zone 41 for taking out the enclosure will damage the sealing print 51, thus leaving apparently noticeable evidence on the envelope. In other words, if the cut were made at (a) position of the sealing print 51 shown in Fig. 1, the envelope would not be opened, while apparently noticeable evidences would be left on the sealing print 51. Moreover, if the cut were made at (b) position of the sealing zone 41 shown in Fig. 1,

the envelope would not be opened, either. Furthermore, even if the cut were made at (c) position beyond the sealing zone 41 shown in Fig. 1, it is impossible to recover or re-seal the envelope and thus the recipient can easily notice the enclosure has been tampered. Therefore, the claimed invention provides a confidential envelope that clearly shows evidence while being opened. Accordingly, this claimed invention is not disclosed or suggested by the cited reference.




Fig. 1

Taylor discloses an envelope which includes a band of color C to indicate to the filler the sum to be placed in each envelope (see *Taylor*, col. 2, lines 4-7). However, the Examiner's Action has not presented any reasoning as to why the claimed invention is anticipated by *Taylor*. Moreover, the band of color C disclosed by *Taylor* is not the equivalent of the sealing print recited in amended claim 14. The band of color C

disclosed by *Taylor* is formed on only two opposite portions of the envelope (see Figures 1-6), whereas, in amended claim 14, the sealing print is formed on all of the four outermost periphery portions of the envelope. More specifically, the sealing print recited in amended claim 14 is formed on each of a top outermost periphery portion, a bottom outermost periphery portion, and two side outermost periphery portions of both the face and the back. Further, the band of color C disclosed by *Taylor* is provided for indicating to the filler the sum to be placed, while the sealing print recited in amended claim 14 is provided for preventing an unauthorized opening. Besides, *Taylor* fails to show the sealing zone recited in the amended claim 14. Accordingly, *Taylor* does not disclose or suggest the sealing print, as recited in amended claim 14.

The Examiner's Action rejects claims 14-17 as being anticipated by *Wroeger* (USP 1,091,028). It is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is clearly patentable over the cited reference for at least the following reasons.

Wroeger is directed to an envelope 11, which includes marks 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 formed in an inner side thereof (see *Wroeger*, Figures 1-3). However, the Examiner's Action has not presented any reasoning as to why the claimed invention is anticipated by *Wroeger*. Moreover, the marks 12-18 disclosed by *Wroeger* is formed in the inner side of the envelope 11 (see Figures 1-3), while the sealing print recited in claim 14 is formed on outer surfaces of both the face and the back. Besides, *Wroeger* fails to show the sealing zone recited in the amended claim 14. Accordingly, *Wroeger* does not disclose or suggest the sealing print, as recited in amended claim 14.

The Examiner's Action rejects claims 14-17 as being anticipated by *Dahlke* (USP 1,714,349). It is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is clearly patentable over the cited reference for at least the following reasons.

Dahlke discloses an envelope which includes a series of differently colored bars or blocks 12, 13 disposed in spaced relation (see *Dahlke*, lines 50-53). However, the Examiner's Action has not presented any reasoning as to why the claimed invention is anticipated by *Dahlke*. Moreover, the envelope disclosed in *Dahlke* is a conventional envelope with the foregoing problems, which is different from the claimed invention.

More specifically, *Dahlke* does not disclose the sealing zone and the sealing print recited in amended claim 14. The colored bars or blocks 12, 13 disclosed by *Dahlke* are formed on the outer surface of the envelope. *Dahlke* does not disclose or suggest anything that the periphery portion of the face of the envelope 10 is adhered to the periphery portion of the back of the envelope 10, as recited in amended claim 14. *Dahlke* thus fails to show the sealing zone recited in the amended claim 14.

Further, the bars or blocks 12, 13 disclosed by *Dahlke* are provided for enabling a quicker sorting or classification by the mail clerks (see lines 6-10), while the sealing print recited in amended claim 14 is provided for preventing an unauthorized opening. Accordingly, *Dahlke* does not disclose or suggest the sealing print, as recited in amended claim 14.

The Examiner's Action rejects claims 14-17 as being anticipated by *Vaucher* (USP 5,478,010). It is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is clearly patentable over the cited reference for at least the following reasons.

Vaucher is directed to an envelope 11, which includes an adhesive material 5 (see *Vaucher*, col. 3, lines 33-35, Figure 3). However, the Examiner's Action has not presented any reasoning as to why the claimed invention is anticipated by *Vaucher*. Moreover, the adhesive material 4, 5 disclosed by *Vaucher* is placed in two portions, i.e., outwards adjacent to the free edge 8 (i.e., beyond the edge 8 of the flap 7) and at the fold edge 3 (see *Vaucher*, col. 1, lines 28-60, Figure 3), whereas the sealing zone recited in claim 14 is formed within the face and the back. Further, *Vaucher* fails to show the sealing print formed on outer surfaces of both the face and the back. Accordingly, *Vaucher* does not disclose or suggest the sealing zone or the sealing print, as recited in amended claim 14.

It is thus submitted that Applicant's independent claim 14, and the claims dependent therefrom, are not anticipated by the cited references.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

The Examiner's Action also rejects claim 18 as being obvious over *Taylor*, *Wroeger*, or *Dahlke*, in view of *Fullerton* (USP 5,205,649). Because *Fullerton* does not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of *Taylor*, *Wroeger*, or *Dahlke*, and because claim 18 depends from independent claim 14, it is submitted that claim 18 is *prima facie* patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as independent claim 14, as well as for the additional features recited therein. It is requested that claim 18 be allowed and that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion:

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such action and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Fees for the Extension of Time and the RCE are being submitted concurrently. Should this remittance be accidentally missing, however, or should any additional fees be needed, please charge the same to our deposit account number 18-0002 and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

July 23, 2007
Date

for Steven M. Berdo 29,102
Robert H. Berdo, Jr.
Registration No. 38,075
RABIN & BERDO, PC
Customer No. 23995
Telephone: 202-371-8976
Facsimile: 202-408-0924

RHB/JJ

AMENDMENT

10/759,302